

**REMARKS**

Applicants have reviewed the Advisory Action mailed November 19, 2010. Claims 1-6 and 15-20 now remain pending in this application. Applicants have cancelled claims 7-14 without prejudice and have amended claims 1 and 17. No new matter has been added. Applicants request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,786,519 to Fujita et al. (hereinafter “Fujita”) in view of EP 817474 to Fegesch (hereinafter “Fegesch”), in further view of EP 579354 to Teece (hereinafter “Teece”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed November 9, 2010, Applicants believe that the present claims patentably distinguish over the cited combination of Fujita, Fegesch and Teece.

Applicants previously pointed out that the present principles recognize that graphical user interfaces (GUIs) do not always constitute the preferred user interface for adjusting critical controls during video production and that “[t]here are many... circumstances where the ‘feel’ of a physical control is preferred to use of a GUI” (Applicant’s Specification: page 3, lines 9-14). Many operations “require that the operator view the result of control adjustment on a video screen, while adjusting the control, but operation of the GUI frequently requires that the operator look at the GUI rather than the video image” (Applicant’s Specification: page 3, lines 10-13). To address the issues, previously presented claim 1 recited a scheme for controlling a production device which involves “responsive to selection of each memory object, physically actuating at least one actuator of the at least one production device to control an operation of the at least one production device” Claim 17 recites analogous language.

Fujita fails to teach or suggest a production system which utilizes physical controls to control a production device.

In fact, not only does this reference fail to teach or suggest the use of physical controls, this reference teaches away from the incorporation of physical controls into the system described therein in stating:

Operator consoles provided with graphical user interface-like input means have the advantages that the display is easy to understand, the operator control panels can be changed dynamically, there are no limits in physical dimensions, and the cost can be reduced by mass production. On the other hand, there are many disadvantages compared with the physical operator consoles using physical dials and other switches such as a greater burden on the eye, a worse hands on feeling in operation, difficulty of inputting fine operations, unsuitability for quick operation, and slow response time.

(Fujita: column 5, lines 4-16)

As evidenced by the above passage, Fujita teaches away from the incorporation of physical controls of any sort into the system described therein. As a result, one of ordinary skill would not look to the teachings of Fujita in order to arrive at the invention of the present application. Rather, Fujita would lead one of ordinary skill in the art down a different path than that taken by the Applicants. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the present rejection lacks propriety for at least this reason.

Although the previously presented claims patentably distinguished over the cited combination of Fujita, Fegesch and Teece for at least the reasons mentioned above, Applicants have amended the present claims in an effort to clarify the claimed invention and to expedite prosecution of the present application. More specifically, applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 17 to now recite, inter alia, *“associating at least one of the memory objects with at least one actuator on a physical control panel”* as indicated in the claim listing provided. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 17 exists at page 10, line 8 – page 11, line 26 of applicants’ originally filed application.

The above amendment to claims 1 and 17 further distinguishes the present claims from the teachings of the cited references. As explained above, Fujita does not teach or suggest the use of physical controls for controlling a production device. Therefore, this reference further fails to teach or suggest that at least one actuator on a “physical control panel” has an associated a memory object as recited in amended claims 1 and 17. Moreover, since the other cited references, Fegesch and Teece, fail

to cure the deficiencies of Fujita in this respect, claims 1 and 17 patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least this reason.

Moreover, "[i]f an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious" (MPEP §2143.03, citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). All remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or 17, or a claim which itself is dependent from one of these claims. Accordingly, all remaining claims patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, applicants request reconsideration of this rejection.


### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Jorge Tony Villabon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 52,322  
Phone (609) 734-6445

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
December 20, 2010